

James Jackson & Lucas Jackson
8702 123rd St E, Puyallup, WA 98373
253-286-8311
complexnucleus@gmail.com
Pro Se

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNKNOWN PARTY

Plaintiff,

vs.

Google LLC, YouTube LLC, JAMES
JACKSON, also known online as
“ONISION,” and LUCAS JACKSON,
formerly known online as “LAINEYBOT,”
“LAINEY” and “KAI,”
Defendants.

Case Number: 3:23-cv-05523-JD

**NOTICE OF OBJECTION TO VIDEO
RECORDING AND REQUEST FOR
PROTECTION FROM PUBLIC
DISTRIBUTION OF COURT
PROCEEDINGS**

Hon. James Donato

I, James Jackson, along with my spouse, Lucas Jackson, respectfully submit this Notice of Objection to any video recording or public distribution of proceedings in the cases identified above¹, pursuant to the Northern District of California’s Cameras in the Courtroom Pilot Project. This objection is submitted in accordance with the Court’s directive for a candid explanation of our reasons for declining participation in public recording and broadcasting of these proceedings.

Upon receiving notice of reassignment of our cases under Judge Donato, we were informed that video recording in the courtroom is presumed unless an objection is filed. We followed the process by submitting our objections to cameras@cand.uscourts.gov, as instructed on the Northern District of California website (cand.uscourts.gov/cameras). We include as EXHIBITS 1 and 2 our communications with Kevin Blumberg of the Cameras in the Courtroom

1 Program, who confirmed that no request for recording had yet been filed in either case
2 (EXHIBITS 3 and 4). However, we submit this notice to formally record our objection to any
3 future requests for video recording of James or Lucas Jackson.
4

5 Our reasons for objecting to video recording and public distribution of court proceedings
6 are as follows:

- 7 1. **Privacy and Trauma of Lucas Jackson:** Sarah not only apologized multiple times for
8 sexually extorting both James and Lucas Jackson (EXHIBITS 5, 6, 20) but also used
9 physical force against Lucas Jackson in a non-consensual act. This incident led Lucas to
10 avoid any further physical contact with Sarah, including Sarah's final visit to the Jackson
11 home (EXHIBIT 7) where Lucas refused to even be in the same state as Sarah. Lucas has
12 avoided public engagement related to this case since Sarah's campaign against him began.
13 A licensed therapist in Puyallup, WA, has diagnosed Lucas Jackson with PTSD, which the
14 therapist attributes to the actions of Sarah (EXHIBIT 21). Lucas Jackson's documented
15 loss of enjoyment of life is attributed to these experiences as recorded by his therapist.
16 Subjecting Lucas to courtroom cameras would be a severe injustice, retraumatizing him by
17 publicly exposing him during the proceedings. Lucas's ability to participate fully and
18 comfortably in this legal process would be compromised if he were placed in a position of
19 continued unjust public scrutiny after enduring such a violation at the hands of Sarah.
- 20 2. **Plaintiffs' Financial Exploitation of the Court Process:** Both Regina Alonso and Sarah
21 have financially benefitted from defamatory campaigns against James and Lucas Jackson
22 (EXHIBIT 8, 9, 10, 11). Regina has leveraged her accusations to promote her adult
23 entertainment business (EXHIBIT 7), while Sarah has raised money through a GoFundMe
24 (EXHIBIT 11), Venmo donations (EXHIBIT 12), and highly defamatory widely
25 broadcasted interviews (EXHIBIT 9). In a recorded phone call, Sarah stated that her
26 international media appearances generated sufficient income to make a substantial
27 purchase, specifically stating she acquired enough money for a down payment on a house
28 (EXHIBIT 13). It is evident that both plaintiffs are using these cases for personal gain

1 rather than for justice. Sarah and Regina have repeatedly sought fame and financial
2 compensation for their participation in defaming the Jacksons, which would only be
3 amplified by further broadcast or recorded hearings.

4 **3. Attorney Lisa Haba's Publicity Efforts:** Lisa Haba's actions in this case strongly
5 suggest an agenda driven more by self-promotion than by pursuit of truth and justice. She
6 has aligned herself with a controversial figure who openly propagates fictitious and
7 sensational narratives about the Jacksons, fueling public outrage and generating revenue
8 through video clicks, Google AdSense, and donations (EXHIBIT 15). This partnership
9 reveals a troubling willingness to exploit inflammatory, unsubstantiated claims for
10 personal and financial gain. Ms. Haba's pattern of leveraging high-profile, yet
11 unsustainable cases for publicity is further illustrated by her recent lawsuit against Twitter
12 which was ultimately dismissed under Section 230 immunity for tech companies in cases
13 involving third-party content (EXHIBIT 16). Additionally, Ms. Haba's extensive history
14 of attempting to extort the Jacksons, despite lacking factual support, highlights a persistent
15 disregard for ethical boundaries and judicial integrity. Allowing cameras in the courtroom
16 would only enable her to manipulate these proceedings as part of a broader agenda
17 focused on career advancement rather than justice, further subjecting the Jacksons to
18 unnecessary exploitation.

19 **4. Unauthorized Distribution of Court Hearings by Plaintiffs' Supporters:** Supporters of
20 Sarah and Regina have disseminated recordings of a prior hearing, one distribution
21 reaching over 197,000 views on a monetized YouTube channel (EXHIBIT 18). This
22 unauthorized distribution exposes all parties to increased public scrutiny and harassment.
23 Allowing further recording would only continue this trend of using our case as mere
24 monetized entertainment, undermining the sanctity of the legal process and harming our
25 ability to seek justice without the anxiety and threats that come from mass exploitation.

26 **5. Pattern of Deceptive Conduct by Plaintiffs:** Lisa Haba, Sarah, and Regina have
27 demonstrated a blatant misuse of the court system, engaging in conduct that prioritizes
28 financial gain over truth and justice (EXHIBITS 15-19). Police records and previous

1 public statements directly contradict their newly fabricated, profit-driven claims, revealing
2 a complete lack of evidence of any criminal conduct on our part (EXHIBIT 20). Despite
3 this, they continue to pursue baseless accusations they themselves previously claimed we
4 were innocent of for financial and personal gain, knowing they lack any factual support.
5 This behavior should not be further encouraged by allowing public recording, which
6 would amplify the harm to our reputation and further the plaintiffs' abusive bad faith
7 tactics.

8
9 Additional Points for Consideration:

- 10 • **Public Misrepresentation and Sensationalization of Facts:** The public monetization of
11 sensationalized and inaccurate narratives has increased the harm we face, and we believe
12 this will escalate if additional recordings are allowed.
- 13 • **Threat to Fair Trial:** Additional publicity undermines our right to a fair trial by
14 prejudicing public perception and adding undue stress and anxiety to the proceedings.
15 Lucas Jackson has been diagnosed with an anxiety disorder, which has been exacerbated
16 by his experiences related to this case. Given his diagnosis of PTSD and the sensitive
17 nature of his circumstances, we respectfully request that the Court provide
18 accommodation to ensure his privacy. Should the Court find it appropriate, sealing the
19 case to protect all parties involved could further promote justice and fairness, particularly
20 in light of the documented evidence presented against the plaintiffs (EXHIBITS 1-21).

21
22 In conclusion, we respectfully request that the Court deny any future requests for video
23 recording of James or Lucas Jackson and limit distribution of the proceedings. This is to protect
24 the integrity of the legal process, uphold our right to a fair trial, and prevent further exploitation of
25 this case for financial gain by the plaintiffs and their known associates. The plaintiffs'
26 exploitation of this case for personal and financial gain, combined with Lucas Jackson's need for
27 privacy as a victim of physical rape at the hands of Sarah, necessitates a careful approach to
28

1 protect the integrity of the judicial process and our right to a fair trial.

2
3 We, James and Lucas Jackson, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United
4 States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

5
6 /s/ James Jackson

/s/ Lucas Jackson

7 James Jackson (Pro se)

Lucas Jackson (Pro se)

8 8702 123rd St E

8702 123rd St E

9 Puyallup, WA 98373

Puyallup, WA 98373

10 Telephone: (253) 286-8311

Telephone: (253) 286-8311

11 Email: complexnucleus@gmail.com

Email: complexnucleus@gmail.com

12 Date: 11/4/24

Date: 11/4/24